



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,951	09/27/2002	Kaneyoshi Kato	2654 USOP	8949

23115 7590 04/02/2004

TAKEDA PHARMACEUTICALS NORTH AMERICA, INC
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
475 HALF DAY ROAD
SUITE 500
LINCOLNSHIRE, IL 60069

EXAMINER

LIU, HONG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1624

DATE MAILED: 04/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/089,951

Applicant(s)

KATO ET AL.

Examiner

Hong Liu

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/02, 06/02, 12/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-38 are pending in this application.

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is more than one page long. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The claim embraces the prevention and treatment of tumor generally. However, there never has been a compound capable of treating tumor generally. There are compounds that treat some range of tumors, but no one had ever been able to figure out how to get a compound to be effective against tumor generally, or even a majority of tumors. Thus, the existence of such a "silver bullet" is contrary to our present understanding in oncology. Even the most broadly effective anti-tumor agents are only effective against a small fraction of the vast number of different cancers known. This is

Art Unit: 1624

true in part because cancers arise from a wide variety of sources, such as viruses (e.g. EBV, HHV-8, and HTLV-1), exposure to chemicals such as tobacco tars, genetic disorders, ionizing radiation, and a wide variety of failures of the body's cell growth regulatory mechanisms. Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body, and different vulnerabilities. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally, evidence that the level of skill in this art is low relative to the difficulty of such a task.

Further, such a term, as set forth in the specification, covers not only all tumors, but also covers any disorders arising from abnormally high rates of proliferation. Thus, it covers precancerous conditions such as different types of abnormal angiogenesis. No agent with anything remotely close to such a scope had ever existed in medicine. When the best efforts have failed to achieve a goal, it is reasonable for the PTO to require evidence that such a goal has been accomplished, *In re Ferens*, 163 USPQ 609. the failure of skilled scientist to achieve a goal is substantial evidence that achieving such a goal is beyond the skill of practitioner in that art, *Genentech vs. Novo Nordisk*, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1006.

In claim 34, instant claim language embraces disorders not only for treatment but also for prophylaxis which is not remotely enabled. It is presumed in the prevention of disease and/or disorders claimed herein there is a way of identifying those people who may develop tumors and cancers, etc. There is no evidence of record which would

Art Unit: 1624

enable the skilled artisan in the identification of the people who have the potential of becoming afflicted with the disorders claimed herein.

Claims 25, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The scope of "prodrug" is not adequately enabled. Applicants provide no guidance as how the compounds are made more active in vivo. The choice of a "prodrug" will vary from drug to drug. Therefore, more than minimal routine experimentation would be required to determine which prodrug will be suitable for the instant invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4, 29-35, 34, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:

1). Claims 29-35 are substantial duplicates of Claim 28 as the only difference is intended use which is not given material weight. Note In re Tuominen 213 USPQ 89.2.

2). Claim 1 is vague and indefinite in that the metes and bounds of term "spacer" are unknown.

3). The phrase "optionally having substituents" throughout claims 1-4 is unclear as to the nature and number of substituent(s) intended.

Art Unit: 1624

2. 4). Regarding claim 34, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

3. 5). Claim 37 provides for the use of the compounds, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-11, 14-23, and 25-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al., Chem Abstract 131: 286420 (WO 99/52875). The instantly claimed compounds read on the reference compound, see the enclosed copy of

Art Unit: 1624

CAPLUS computer search report and the compounds which the provisos in claim 1 do not exclude.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (WO 99/52875). The reference teaches a generic group of compounds which embraces applicant's instantly claimed compounds. See formula I, page 5 wherein ring AB represents quinoline, X represents C(O), Y represents an alkyl substituted by a group represented by formula 3 on page 8, etc. The compounds are taught to be useful as somatostatin inhibitors. The claims differ from the reference by reciting a specific species and/or a more limited genus than the reference (see the compounds made in the reference and given in the above 102 rejection). However, it would have nevertheless been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to select any of the species of the genus taught by the reference including those instantly claimed, because the skilled chemist would have the reasonable expectation that any of the specie of the genus would have similar properties and, thus, the same use as taught for the genus as a whole. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the


Art Unit: 1624

genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole. It has been held that a prior art disclosed genus of useful compounds is sufficient to render prima facie obvious a species falling within a genus. See *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the Federal Circuit in *Merck & Co. V. Biocraft Laboratories*, 847 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Hong Liu whose telephone number is (571) 272-0669. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by the phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisors, Mukund Shah can be reached at (571) 272-0674. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 358-1235.


Mukund Shah
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1624

hl
March 29, 2004